# UNCLASSIFIED AD

FOR
MICRO-CARD
CONTROL ONLY

1 COF

Armed Services Technical Information Agency

ARLINGTON HALL STATION; ARLINGTON 12 VIRGINIA

### UNGLASSIFIED

"NOTICE: When Government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related Government procurement operation, the U.S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto."

## AD NO. 294 8/7 ASTIA FILE COPY

Shock Waves in Chemical Kinetics: The Thermal Decomposition of NO2 FILE COPY

ASTIA
ASTIA
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA

Attn: 71888

by Robert E. Huffman and Norman Davidsor

1. From the Ph.D. thesis by R. E. H.; California Institute of Technology, 1958.

### Abstract

The thermal decomposition of NO<sub>2</sub> in argon, NO<sub>2</sub> mixtures has been investigated by the shock wave method, using both incident and reflected shocks. The argon: NO<sub>2</sub> ratio was varied from 360 to 5.6, and the temperature was varied from 1400° to 2300° K.

The rate law is

$$-d(NO_2)/dt = \underline{k}_0 (M)(NO_2) + \underline{k}_0 (NO_2)^2$$
.

(M) is the total (mainly argon) gas concentration, and  $\underline{k}_{u} = 3.06 \times 10^{13}$  exp (-65,400/RT) mole  $\frac{1}{10}$  (exp -25,000 (+ 5000)/RT) mole  $\frac{1}{10}$  (exp -25,000)

The  $\underline{k}_u$  term in the rate law is believed to be due to the unimolecular dissociation at its low pressure limit,

$$M + NO_2 \xrightarrow{\frac{K_U}{2}} M + NO + O$$
 (6)

 $0 + 000 \longrightarrow 0_2 + 10$  (fast)

and it is shown that measurements of the reverse of reaction (6) at

-

low temperature are in agreement with our high temperature values for  $\underline{k}_{11}$ .

The  $\underline{k}_b$  term is partly due to the "Bodenstein bimolecular path." However, the values of  $\underline{k}_b$  are about eight times greater than the extrapolated values for the Bodenstein mechanism; there may be some other bimolecular path which contributes to the decomposition.

The results illustrate a characteristic feature of high temperature chemistry; namely, that a number of reaction paths frequently contribute to an overall chemical transformation.

The thermal decomposition of  $NO_2$ 

$$2110_2 \longrightarrow 2110 + 0_2$$
 (1)

is in many respects one of the classical examples of a bimolecular reaction. It was studied by Bodenstein and Ramstetter and later by

1. M. Bodenstein and H. Ramstetter, Z. physik. Chem., 100, 105 (1922).

others, including Rosser and Wise. 2 For the rate constant between

2. W. A. Rosser, Jr. and H. Wise, J. Chom. Phys., 24, 493 (1956).

600° K and 1000° K, the latter authors give

$$-\frac{1}{(NO_2)^2} \frac{d(NO_2)}{dt} = k_{1b} = 4.0 \times 10^9 \exp(-26,900/kT) \text{ mols}^{-1} \text{ liter sec}^{-1} (2)$$

(Subscript <u>b</u> implies the belief that this constant is for the "Bodenstein mechanism," with the O N transition state for reaction 1.) A transition state calculation, with reasonable values for the distances and vibration frequencies of the activated complex, which is assumed to be O N , agrees rather well with the observed preexponential factor. At low temperatures, the reverse termolecular reaction has

3. D. R. Herschbach, H. S. Johnston, K. S. Pitzer and R. E. Powell, J. Chem. Phys., 25, 736 (1956).

a small negative temperature coefficient which has been extensively studied; above  $500^{\circ}$  K, this rate constant is essentially constant in accordance with (2).

4. H. J. Schumacher "Chemische Gasreaktionen," Theodor Steinkopf, Leipzig, 1938; pp. 311-320.

By observing the very early stages of the reaction, Ashmore and Levitt<sup>5</sup> discovered that the initial rate of pyrolysis near 700° K is

5. P. G. Ashmore and B. P. Levitt, Research (Correspondence), 9, 525 (1956).

greater than that observed by previous investigators; this additional contribution to the rate is quenched as NO forms, or if NO is added to the initial mixture. These phenomena are attributed to the new reaction path

$$NO_2 + NO_2 = \frac{k_3}{k_4} NO_3 + NO$$
 (3.4)

$$NO_3 + NO_2 \xrightarrow{\underline{k}_5} NO_2 + O_2 + NO \tag{5}$$

This proposal is consistent with the properties of  $NO_3$  as determined in other investigations. 6.7

6. N. Davidson and G. Schott, J. Chem. Phys., 27, 317 (1957); P. G. Ashmore and B. P. Levitt, ibid., 27, 318 (1957).

7. G. Schott and N. Davidson THIS JOURNAL, 80, 1841 (1958).

We report here a shock tube study of the rate of the same reaction in NO<sub>2</sub>, argon mixtures from 1400°-2300° K. In addition to the bimolecular reaction path, there is a unimolecular dissociation path

$$A + NO_2 \longrightarrow A + NO + O \tag{6}$$

$$0 + ONO \longrightarrow 0_2 + NO \text{ (fast)}$$

There is available a brief preliminary report of another shock wave investigation. 8 The experimental results in the two studies agree

rather well; the differences in interpretation will be considered below.

<sup>8.</sup> M. Steinburg and T. F. Lyon, abstract of paper presented before Inorganic and Physical Chemistry Section, 131st National Meeting, American Chemical Society, Miami, Florida, April, 1957.

### Experimental

The shock tube is essentially as described before, 9,10 but some-

what longer. The diameter was 15 cm.; the driving section was a 270 cm. length of aluminum pipe; the shock wave section consisted of a 140 cm. long aluminum pipe, and two 150 cm. long sections of pyrex pipe.

The principal experimental innovation in our present work was the observation of reaction rates behind reflected shocks in some instances. This was particularly convenient when high ratios of argon to NO<sub>2</sub> were desired (the range of NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations being to some extent fixed by light absorption considerations) at high temperatures. The high argon pressures and high temperatures are more conveniently produced in reflected shocks; furthermore, since there is no \*time compression,\* very fast reaction rates are more readily measured behind reflected shocks. For experiments with reflected shock waves, a special end plate was used which placed the reflecting surface about 12 centimeters in front of the end of the glass pipe. The clearance between the circumference of this plate and the inside glass wall was about one mm. A plunger arrangement allowed the portion of the shock tube behind the reflecting surface to be evacuated through a hole in

<sup>9.</sup> D. Britton, N. Davidson, and G. Schott, <u>Discussions Faraday</u>
Soc. No. 17, 58 (1954).

<sup>10.</sup> D. Britton, N. Davidson, W. Gehman, and G. Schott, J. Chem. Phys., 25, 804 (1956).

the reflecting plate. This opening could then be closed immediately before the diaphragm was burst. The reflecting surface was about 3 cm from the station at which observations of the reflected shock were made.

In all experiments, incident shock velocities were measured using Schlieren techniques as before.

The mercury arc light sources and filter combinations have been described before. 7,9,10 However, the Osram HBO 200 high pressure arc which was used with great success before became unstable in operation, even with new lamps, and was not used very much. In most experiments, the NO<sub>2</sub> concentration was monitored using the Hg 405 or 436 mg line. For experiments with high concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub>, the 546 mg line was isolated from a Hanovia arc with a Baird multilayer interference filter and a Corning 3486 cut off filter.

NO<sub>2</sub> was prepared as before. Nitric oxide, NO, (Matheson), with NO<sub>2</sub> as the principal impurity, was fractionally distilled twice from the liquid at -150° C into a trap at -196°; the resulting solid was a light gray material, which melted to give a light greenish-blue liquid.

Calculations.—Experiments with incident shocks were made with  $NO_2$ , argon mixtures with initial  $NO_2$  mole fractions of 0.023 to 0.15. The methods described previously for calculating the temperature and density from the measured velocity and for correcting for the change in these parameters as the endothermic reaction proceeded were used. Appropriate small corrections for the enthalpy and composition of the unshocked gas due to the equilibrium,  $N_2O_4 = 2NO_2$ , were made.

The reflected shock experiments were done with  $\mathtt{NO}_2$  mole fractions of about 0.003, 0.007 and a few at 0.023. In this case, the calculations were made for pure argon. Only in the case of the 0.023 mole fraction would the corrections be significant. However, it would be very difficult to make a proper correction. If observations were made far from the end plate, so that reaction had gone to equilibrium at the end plate, and the reflected shock had reached an appropriate steady value, corrections could readily be made. However, it is undesirable to make observations at a great distance from the end plate because of boundary layer problems and because of possible disturbances due to the "contact surface." Observations are actually made close (3 cm) to the end plate. Thus if the reaction is being observed, it has not yet gone to completion at the end plate and the rarefaction wave resulting from the endothermic reaction has not slowed down the reflected shock to its final steady value. That is, a steady state has not been achieved. Calculations for the non-steady situation would be very complicated. We have accordingly made calculations assuming the gas was pure argon. 11 The cooling would at most produce a temperature

<sup>11.</sup> The appropriate equations are given by F. W. Geiger and G. W. Mauts "The Shock Tube as an Instrument for the Investigation of Transonic and Supersonic Flow Patterns," Engineering Research Institute, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1949. (ONR report)

change of 100° K, and the initial rate constant would not be affected wery much.

It may be noted that the reflected shock velocities could be obtained from the experimental data (since the passage of both incident and reflected shocks are observed on the oscilloscope trace); these measured velocities agreed with the velocities calculated from the incident velocities. However, because of the large error in the reflected shock velocity measurements, this is not a critical confirmation of the validity of the reflected shock experiments. The best confirmation comes from the agreement between rate data from incident and reflected shock experiments. The reflected shock pictures all looked good and in accordance with ideal shock tube theory.

### Results

Extinction Coefficients.—Extinction coefficient data are determined as part of the kinetic records. They are not highly accurate.

The results are summarized in Table 1. They agree fairly well, but not perfectly, with those given by Schott. As expected, the absorption coefficients near the maximum decrease with increasing temperature; at 546 mg, on the edge of the absorption band, ds/dT 0.

Table 1
Extinction Coefficients for NO2

	<b>~</b>					
TOK	300	800	1000	1500	2000	
€(405 mµ)*	164	140	130	113	95	
€(436 mµ)	144	118	112	100	87	
€(546 mµ)	29		55	63		

<sup>&</sup>quot; $\xi = (1/c1) \log_{10} (I/I)$  mole liter cm<sup>-1</sup>.

The average deviation of the results is about 10%.

Kinetics.—The principal experimental results are values of initial rate constants. Ten groups of reactions were done in which the  $NO_2$  concentration, the argon concentration, and their ratio were widely varied. The approximate conditions of each group of experiments are given in Table 2, where (M) = total gas concentration (argon plus  $NO_2$ ). Since the

Table 2
Range of Experimental Conditions

(M) (NO <sub>2</sub> )	<u>Unahocked</u> gas Mole Fraction NO <sub>2</sub>		Shocked	<u>Wave</u> region	
	$(x 10^2)$	Pressure (atm)	mole liter x10	mole liter x10 <sup>3</sup>	
3 <i>5</i> 7	0.28	0.1	•8	30	reflected
143	0.7	0.04	•8	11	•
44	2.3	0.019	1.5	6	•
44	2•3	0.04	1.5	6	incident
20	5•O	0.02	1.5	3	9
20*	<b>5.</b> 0	0.02	1.5	3	•
20	5.0	0.04	3	6	•
10	10	0.01	1.5	1.5	•
10	10	0.02	3	3	•
6.7	15	0.03	8	4	•

<sup>\*0.04</sup> mole fraction NO added.

compression ratio is a (slowly varying) function of the shock strength, concentrations in the shocked gas varied slightly for constant initial conditions. Exact conditions are given elsewhere.

As we shall see, the evidence indicates that the rate law is

$$\frac{-d(ro_2)}{dt} = k_u(M)(no_2) + k_b(no_2)^2$$
 (8)

The  $\underline{k}_{\underline{y}}$  term corresponds to a second order process, first order in (M) (essentially argon) and first order in  $NO_2$ . As discussed later, we believe that it is the unimolecular dissociation of  $NO_2$  at its low pressure, second order limit. The  $\underline{k}_{\underline{b}}$  term is second order in  $NO_2$  and is attributed to a true bimolecular reaction.

In order to plot the data at varying  $(M)/(NO_2)$  ratios, an apparent "first order in  $NO_2$ " rate constant is defined.

$$\underline{k}_9 = -\frac{1}{(M)(NO_2)} \frac{d(NO_2)}{d\underline{t}}$$
 (9)

The results so calculated are displayed in Fig. 1. Note that if  $\underline{k}_b$  were sero,  $\underline{k}_0 = \underline{k}_u$ , and  $\underline{k}_0$  would be an Arrhenius function of the temperature and independent of the gas composition. A similar plot of the defined rate constant,

$$\underline{k}_{10} = -(1/(NO_2)^2 d(NO_2)/d\underline{t}$$
 (10)

could be made.

An effort has been made in Fig. 1 to indicate the approximate argon and NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations for each point. This makes the plot necessarily rather complicated. Careful scrutiny of Fig. 1 and of the corresponding plot for  $k_{10}$  reveals that the points at low NO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions,  $2.8 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $7.0 \times 10^{-3}$ , at the higher temperatures fit the  $k_{9}$  interpretation and indicate a high activation energy. For the

2.8 x  $10^{-3}$  mole fraction points, this is 57 kcal mole<sup>-1</sup>. The points at high NO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions (0.05, 0.10, 0.15), particularly at lower temperatures, fit the  $\underline{k}_{10}$  interpretation better and indicate a low (23  $\pm$  4 kcal) activation energy.

Theory indicates that the local activation energy for the unimolecular process  $(\underline{k}_u)$  should be about 65.4 kcal mole near 2000° K. Once  $\underline{k}_u$  is known, values of  $\underline{k}_b$  can be calculated from the data in Fig. 1 by the relation,  $\underline{k}_b = ((M)/(NO_2))(\underline{k}_0 - \underline{k}_u)$ . By a trial process, a line for  $\underline{k}_u$  with a slope corresponding to an activation energy of 65.4 was chosen so as to give a good fit for  $\underline{k}_b$ . This expression is

$$k_{\rm H} = 3.06 \times 10^{13} \exp(-65.400/\text{RT}) \text{ mole}^{-1} \sec^{-1}$$
 (11)

and is the straight line in Fig. 1. Clearly the value of  $\underline{k}_{u}$  affects only the high temperature results. The points on the Arrhenius plot for the values of  $\underline{k}_{b}$  thus calculated show a fair amount of scatter, but it is significant that the points with low NO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions (0.0028, 0.007, 0.023) are now much more consistent with the data from the high NO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions. When the points at high NO<sub>2</sub> mole fractions (0.05, .10, .15) are graphed by themselves, they give a quite good straight line plot (Fig. 2) from which

$$k_h = 2.5 \times 10^{10} - \exp(-25,000(\pm 5000)/RT) \text{mole}^{-1} 1 \text{ sec}^{-1}$$
 (12)

### Discussion

The Unimolecular Dissociation.—The term in the rate law,  $k_{11}(A)(NO_2)$ , is reasonably attributed to the mechanism

$$A + NO_2 \xrightarrow{\underline{k}_{6n}} A + NO + O$$
 (6)

$$0 + 0NO \xrightarrow{k_7} 0_2 + NO \tag{7}$$

At high temperatures, the reverse of (6) is unimportant. Ford and  $Endow^{12}$  give  $k_7 = 2 \times 10^9$  mole<sup>-1</sup> 1 sec<sup>-1</sup> at 300° K. A simple transition

12. H. Ford and N. Endow, J. Chem. Phys., 27, 1156 (1957).

state argument suggests that  $k_7$  increases approximately as sither  $T^{1/2}$  or T, so we guesstimate  $k_7 = 5 \times 10^9$  mole  $^{-1}$  liter sec  $^{-1}$  at 2000° K. With  $(NO_2) = 10^{-4}$  mole  $1^{-1}$ , the average lifetime of an 0 atom for reaction (7) is therefore 2 psec. With  $k_{6d} = 3 \times 10^6$  mole  $^{-1}$  1 sec  $^{-1}$  and  $(A) = 3 \times 10^{-2}$ , which corresponds to the fastest reaction rates measured (cf., Fig. 1), the mean reaction time is about 10 psec. Thus possibly for the very fastest reactions measured, reaction (7) was not quite but almost in a steady state with respect to (6). For all other cases, (7) was certainly adequately fast, so that  $k_0 = 2k_{6d}$ . Therefore  $k_{6d} = k_0/2 = 1.5 \times 10^{13}$  exp(-65,400/RT) mole  $^{-1}$  1 sec  $^{-1}$ 

We may compare this result with an extrapolated, calculated value based on the measurement of the reverse rate by Ford and Endow. They give  $\underline{k}_{6\pi} = 1.8 \times 10^{10} \text{ mole}^{-2} \text{ l}^2 \text{ sec}^{-1}$  at  $300^{\circ}$  K with N<sub>2</sub> as the "third body" M. The classical version of the Rice, Ramsperger, Kassels theory

suggest for a reaction like (6),

$$\underline{k}_{6d} = \underline{z} \left( \frac{\underline{E}_{0}}{\underline{R}\underline{T}} \right)^{5-1} = \exp(-\underline{E}_{0}/\underline{R}\underline{T})$$
 (14)

where  $\underline{Z}$  is a collision number and  $\underline{g}$  is the number of effective oscillators—in this case three. For  $\underline{E}_0$  we take  $\underline{\Delta}\underline{E}_0^0 = 71,400$  cal. The term in front of the exponential varies as  $1/T^{3/2}$ . (The Slater theory of unimolecular reactions gives a similar expression, perhaps with a smaller value of  $\underline{g}$ . It is plausible that an available energy treatment such as that of RRK is better than the critical coordinate treatment of Slater for a simple molecule.)

The equilibrium constant for reaction (6) can be expressed in the form

$$\underline{K}_{6} = \frac{\underline{Q}_{0}\underline{Q}_{NO}}{\underline{Q}_{NO_{2}}} \exp(-\underline{\Delta}\underline{E}_{0}^{0}/\underline{RT})$$
 (15)

where the Q's are partition functions. The vibrational partition function for NO<sub>2</sub> is due to two stretches and one bend. Assume that for the stretching frequencies,  $Q_{ViB}\sim 1$ ; for the bend,  $Q=kT/h\gamma$ . Considering the contributions of rotation and translation, the equilibrium constant is of the form  $K_6=E\exp(-\Delta E_0^0/RT)$ , where E is temperature independent. In view of (14),  $k_{6r}\sim 1/T^{3/2}$ . Assume that argon is about one-half as effective as N<sub>2</sub> as a third body; therefore  $k_{6r}$  (300°, A) = 1.0 x 10<sup>10</sup> mole<sup>2</sup>  $1^{-2}$  sec<sup>-1</sup> and  $k_{6r}(A)=5.2 \times 10^{13}/T^{3/2}$  mole<sup>2</sup>  $1^{-2}$  sec<sup>-1</sup> (16)

From standard thermodynamic data, 13,14,15 the equilibrium constant for

- 13. Selected Values of Chemical Thermodynamic Properties, Mational Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C., Series III (1954).
- 14. H. W. Wooley, The NBS-NACA Tables of Thermal Properties of Gases, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C., Tables 15.10 and 15.11 (1950).
- 15. Selected Values of Chemical Thermodynamic Properties, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C., Circular 500, Series I (1952).
- (6) at  $2000^{\circ}$  K is  $1.15 \times 10^{-3}$  mole  $1^{-1}$ , and we may write  $\underline{K}_{6} = 7.3 \times 10^{4}$  exp(-71,400/RT). We therefore calculate from the low temperature value of  $\underline{K}_{6\pi}$ ,

$$k_{64} = (3.8 \times 10^{18}/T^{3/2}) \exp(-71.400/RT) \text{ mole}^{-1} \text{ liter sec}^{-1}$$
 (17)

The expression (13) for the high temperature rate data in the neighborhood of 2000°, when recast in the form expressed by equation (14) gives

$$\underline{k}_{6d} = (6.0 \times 10^{18}/\underline{r}^{3/2}) \exp(-71.400/R\underline{r})$$
 (18)

Thus the extrapolated (17) and experimental (18) high temperature data agree remarkably well. Equation (14) above can be rewritten as

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{k}}}_{6d} = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{Z}}}_{1000} \quad \left(\frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{T}}}}{1000}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}_{0}}{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{RT}}}}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \exp(-\underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}_{0}/\underline{\underline{\mathbf{RT}}}).$$

where  $\underline{Z}_{1000}$  is the collision number at  $1000^{\circ}$ . Numerical evaluation from (18) gives  $\underline{Z}_{1000} = 2.9 \times 10^{11}$  mole<sup>-1</sup> liter sec<sup>-1</sup>, which is quite reasonable.

In the interpretation above, we have not attempted to consider the effect of possible differences between  $NO_2$  itself and A as energy transfer agents for reaction (6). Because of the low  $(NO_2)/(A)$  ratios, it is unlikely that any special effects due to  $NO_2$  would be evident.

Thus we may say that the interpretation of the high temperature, high dilution,  $\underline{k}_{ij}(M)(MO_2)$  term in the rate law as being due to the unimolecular dissociation of  $MO_2$  at its low pressure limit followed by reaction (7) is quite satisfactory.

The Bimolecular Path.—It is natural to try to attribute the bimolecular term in the rate law,  $k_b(NO_2)^2$ , to the "Bodenstein mechanism," which we picture in detail as

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 + 0 = 0$$

$$0 +$$

In ref. 3 (HJPP), a detailed transition state analysis for this reaction is given. The empirical rate law around  $570^{\circ}$  K is  $\underline{k}_{1b} = 4.0 \times 10^{9}$  exp (-26,900/RT)  $N^{-1}$  sec<sup>-1</sup>. This is the lowest straight line in Fig. 3. The middle curve in the figure is calculated from the transition state theory using the frequency assignment and structure for the transition state given by HJPP. It too is lower than the experimental curve.

The transition state expression is,

$$E_{1b}/2 = \frac{ET}{h} \frac{Q(N_2O_A^{*})}{Q(NO_2)^2} \exp(-E_0/RT)$$
 (19)

where the Q's are partition functions. The assignment of HJPP gives  $E_0 = 25,900$  keal mole<sup>-1</sup>. A simple approximate argument in which vibrational partition functions are cancelled when their frequencies are close and are taken as having the limiting form, kT/hy, for low frequencies, indicates that  $k_{1b}$  can be approximately represented by  $k_{1b} \sim T^{3/2} \exp(-E_0/kT)$  at the higher temperatures, which explains why the transition state extrapolation lies above the simple Arrhenius extrapolation. (However the transition state extrapolation in Fig. 3 is based on an exact calculation of the partition functions using the HJPP frequencies and not on the approximate representation given above).

The question now is whether there is some other bimolecular reaction path since the extrapolated  $\underline{k}_{1b}$  rate constants are less than the experimental ones  $(\underline{k}_b)$  by a factor of about 8 (at  $\underline{c}_a$  1667° K).

One such possibility is the Ashmore and Levitt (AL) path (reactions 3, 4, 5). The rate law for this is

$$-\frac{1}{(NO_2)^2} \frac{d(NO_2)}{dt} = \frac{2 \frac{k_3}{4}}{1 + \frac{k_4}{(NO)/k_5(NO_2)}}$$

According to AL, at  $707^{\circ}$  K,  $2k_3 = 26$  mole<sup>-1</sup> liter sec<sup>-1</sup>, and  $k_4/k_5 = 60$ , whereas  $2k_{1b} = 19.4$ . Thus the two mechanisms contribute approximately equally to the initial rate.

The ratio  $k_4/k_5 = 60$  implies that when NO has accumulated so that  $(NO)/(NO_2) > 1/60$ , the NO<sub>3</sub> reaction path is suppressed compared to the Bodenstein path.

The available information  $^{6,7}$  about NO<sub>3</sub> indicates that  $\Delta E$  for reaction (3) is 23,000 cal. Kinetic information about  $k_{4}$  indicates an activation energy close to zero.  $^{16}$ 

16. I. C. Hisatsune, B. Crawford and R. A. Ogg, THIS JOURNAL, 29, 4648 (1957).

Furthermore, AL report  $E_3 - E_{1b} = 3 \pm 3$  kcal. Thus, all the

17. Private communication.

evidence suggests that the activation energy for reaction (3) is either slightly less than or at most equal to that for reaction (1). Since the two rates are comparable at 707° K, it is predicted that the NO<sub>2</sub> process would make at most an equal contribution with the Bodenstein mechanism at high temperatures.

The activation energy difference,  $\underline{E}_5 - \underline{E}_4$  is at most the value of  $\underline{E}_5$  of 3900 cal, so that at 1750,  $\underline{k}_4/\underline{k}_5 \geq 12$ . Thus NO should still be a potent inhibitor for the NO<sub>3</sub> reaction path at the high temperatures of the present investigation. It is possible however that some other reaction faster than (5) destroys NO<sub>3</sub> at the high temperatures. An attractive possibility is the unimolecular decomposition of NO<sub>3</sub> at its low pressure limit.  $\underline{K}^7$ 

$$NO_3 + M = \frac{k_{21d}}{\sqrt{k_{21r}}} NO_2 + O + M$$
 (21)

Consideration of the nature of the partition functions suggests that the equilibrium constant for reaction (21) can be approximately represented as  $\underline{K}_{21} = \underline{A}\underline{T}^{-1/2} \exp(-\underline{\Delta}\underline{E}^0/\underline{R}\underline{T})$ . The low temperature data then give  $\underline{k}_{21} = 1.9_5 \times 10^7 \ \underline{T}^{-1/2} \exp(-49,600/\underline{R}\underline{T})$  mole  $1^{-1}$ , or  $\underline{K} = 0.29$  (1750° K). Ford and Endow report  $\underline{k}_{21\underline{T}} = 10^{11}$  mole  $2^{-1}$  sec  $1^{-1}$  at 298°K, and we surmise  $\underline{k}_{21\underline{T}} \sim \underline{T}^{-3/2}$ , so that  $\underline{k}_{21\underline{T}} = 5.2 \times 10^{14} \ \underline{T}^{-3/2}$ . This gives a reasonable expression for  $\underline{k}_{21\underline{T}}$ :

$$\underline{k}_{21d} = 10^{22} \, \underline{T}^{-2} \, \exp(-49,600/\underline{RT}) \, \text{mole}^{-1} \, 1 \, \text{sec}^{-1}$$
 (22)

or  $k_{21d} = 2 \times 10^9$  at 1750° K.

If reaction (21) replaces (5), the rate law for the NO3 path is

$$-\frac{1}{(NO_2)^2} \frac{d(NO_2)}{dt} = \frac{2 \underline{k}_3}{1 + \underline{k}_4(NO)}$$
(23)

From the estimate of Schott and Davidson,  $^{7}$   $_{k_{\perp}} = 4 \times 10^{10} \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  at  $1750^{\circ}$  K. Using the values of (NO) and (A) present in the experiments with added NO (where no significant inhibition was observed),  $_{k_{\perp}}(NO)/k_{\perp}$  at  $1750^{\circ}$  K. Thus indeed, as regards the absence of inhibition by NO, the NO<sub>3</sub> reaction path might be important at  $1750^{\circ}$ . At the lowest temperature of this investigation (1400° K),  $_{k_{\perp}}$  is about 1/50 of its value at  $1750^{\circ}$  K. This is still large enough to be a fast follow reaction for reaction (3), but NO would now certainly be a potent inhibitor. Unfortunately, this important point was recognized after the experimental work was concluded and this crucial accounterly test of the modified NO<sub>2</sub> reaction path has not been performed.

Comparison with Other Work.—As previously noted, the results of Steinburg and Lyon on the same system over the same temperature range are somewhat different. They find all their data may be accounted for by the rate expression

$$E_{SL} = -\frac{1}{(NO_2)(A)} \frac{d(NO_2)}{dt} = 3.82 \times 10^{11} \exp(-46,100/RT) \text{ mole}^{-1} 1 \sec^{-1} (24)$$

Near 2000° K, the results are in agreement. The expression above gives  $k_{\rm SL} = 3.4 \times 10^6$  mole<sup>-1</sup> 1 sec<sup>-1</sup>, whereas in Fig. 1, we give  $k = 2.7 \times 10^6$ . If our interpretation of the data is correct, the activation energy of 46,100 observed by SL is an average of the activation energies of the high temperature  $k_{\rm u}$  (A)(NO<sub>2</sub>) term with an activation energy of 65,000 cal and the low temperature  $k_{\rm b}$  (NO<sub>2</sub>)<sup>2</sup> term will an activation energy of 25,000 (± 5000) cal.

Insert 1,

Conclusion.—In summary then, it is believed that the most reasonable interpretation of the shock tube experiments, taking into account the experimental data, extrapolation of other results, and general theoretical considerations, is that NO<sub>2</sub> is decomposing by two paths. One is the unimolecular decomposition of NO<sub>2</sub> into NO and O with a rate law,  $-d(NO_2)/dt = k_0(NO_2)(M)$  and an activation energy of about 65 kcal. The second is a bimolecular decomposition,  $-d(NO_2)/dt = k_0(NO_2)^2$ , with an activation energy of  $25 \pm 6$  kcal. It should be reemphasized that the random error in our shock tube experiments is rather large, so that the above conclusions have not been established with as much certainty as is desirable. However, the data do strongly support the interpretation given.

The phenomenon encountered is characteristic of high temperature reactions - namely that a high activation energy, high steric factor reaction path replaces a low activation energy, low steric factor path as the temperature is raised.

of eight than extrapolated values for the bimolecular "Bodenstein" mechanism for which the transition state is believed to be

No. It seems unlikely, but not entirely excluded, that this is due to an error in extrapolation. Possibly a simple extension of the Ashmore and Levitt No<sub>3</sub> mechanism, including reaction 21, can account for the additional reaction path. However, the data now available indicate that this should increase the extrapolated rate only by a factor of two. Possibly there is some other as yet unrecognized reaction path. Fossibly the discrepancy is in the present work. This question requires further work, but the present investigation has fairly definitely established the occurrence of both unimolecular and bimolecular reaction paths.

### Insert 1, p. 19

and Lyon<sup>8</sup> was also observed in all of our experiments. This emission was distinctly seen under normal laboratory lights. An extensive study was not made. A few photoelectric oscilloscope traces indicated that the light emission decreased as (NO<sub>2</sub>) decreased. This emission interfered with the light absorption measurements only at 546 mg where appropriate small corrections were made.

### Acknowledgment

This work has been supported by the O.N.R. One of us has received fellowships from the Corning Glass Works Foundation and the General Education Board.

An initial investigation of the shock pyrolysis of NO<sub>2</sub> was carried out in these laboratories several years ago by Dr. W. R. Gilkerson.

Our work has been developed on the basis of the foundation which he laid.

### Legends for Figures

- Fig. 1. Observed rate constants calculated assuming  $d(NO_2)/d\underline{t} = \underline{k}_0$  (M) (NO<sub>2</sub>).
- Fig. 2. Values for  $\underline{k}_0$  from  $-d(NO_2)/d\underline{t} = \underline{k}_0 (NO_2)^2$  for high  $NO_2$  mole fraction experiments.



